Public Works
~~Marine~~ (189) Department.

X 338

G.O., No. 2012 }
2025 }

DATED 24th Feb '99

Urgent

3/4/99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Periyar Project

Ordered that the correspondence in regard to the incidence of the cost of draining the beds of abandoned tanks under the to render them fit for cultivation be forwarded to the Govt of India for orders.

Periyar Project

Forwarding, for early orders, correspondence in regard to the incidence of the cost of draining the beds of abandoned tanks under the to render them fit for cultivation.

[M. S. 500-23]

[illegible] [illegible]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

IRRIGATION.

Government (1899) of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd. } 1899. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., Nos. 201, 202 I., 24th February 1899.

FEBRUARY.

Periyar Project

Forwarding, for early orders, correspondence in regard to the incidence of the cost of draining the beds of abandoned tanks under the — to render them fit for cultivation.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.

Read—the following papers :—

From Lieutenant-Colonel O. V. BODDY, R.E., Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Kodaikánal, 18th May 1898, No. 713 M.D.

Estimates exceeding Rs. 2,500 each have been received for abandoning certain tanks under the Periyár channels in Madura and Melur taluks to be met from Provincial funds under "43. Minor works and Navigation for which neither Capital nor Revenue accounts are kept, P.W.D.,"—"*Repairs*." In paragraph 2 of your memorandum printed with G.O., No. 710 I., dated 19th August 1896, it is said that the cost of draining the tank beds to fit them for cultivation should be debited to "Land Revenue." As this sub-head is not to be found in the classification of the transactions of Executive Engineers in Appendix I, Volume II of the Public Works Department Code, I have the honour to request that you will be good enough to inform me whether the classification of the estimates under Ordinary Irrigation—Repairs is correct and whether they may be sanctioned by this office.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), 24th August 1898, Mis. No. 2284.

From T. HESKETH BIGGS, Esq., Accountant-General, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 24th August 1898, No. 4052.

With reference to your memo., No. 1673, dated the 9th of August 1898, enquiring to which department should be debited the cost of draining the beds of abandoned tanks commanded by the Periyár channels, I have the honour to report that, as the work is necessary owing to the construction of the Periyár project and will also be carried out by the professional agency of the Public Works Department, the cost should be debited to the Public Works Department under "43. Minor works and Navigation" in charge of Public Works officers.

Endorsement of the Revenue Department, dated 6th November 1898.

Office-note to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 11th November 1898, No. 344.

I should be obliged if you will kindly reconsider your No. 734 A./B., dated 13th June 1898, as the case was not fully stated in my endorsement, No. 171, dated 2nd June 1898. Under G.O., No. 1026, dated 7th October 1892, 4 per cent. of the amount realized by the sale of abandoned tanks in the area commanded by the Periyár project will have to be credited to the project, but to give the tank beds any value and fit them for irrigation the beds must be drained or the water level at least lowered in some way so as to lay dry most of the bed. The cost of doing this will be considerable as nearly 1,000 tanks have to be dealt with. Seeing that the project is to have the full benefit of the improvement which drainage will effect, is it allowable to charge the cost of the drainage to other than project funds? and if the project be charged with the cost, to what sub-head of the accounts could the charge be debited?

(Signed) W. HUGHES,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Office-note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 22nd November 1898, No. 1352 A./B.

Under the circumstances now explained I see no objection to the cost of the improvements in question forming a charge against project funds under *49. Irrigation—Imperial*, or *43. Minor Works* * *and Navigation—Provincial*, according as new or old irrigation derives benefit from the outlay thus incurred. The particular sub-head affected in the former case would apparently be (2) Main canals and branches—15. Miscellaneous (*vide* Public Works Code, II, Appendix II, page lvii). In the latter case there would be no sub-head.

* Works for which Capital and Revenue Accounts are not kept.

I think however that, if this be agreed to, the proposal to act accordingly should be reported to India for information and orders.

No. 306 I.

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

The estimate of revenue of the Periyár project on which the forecast which accompanied the revised estimate was based, takes into account the irrigation of the beds of the tanks, nearly all of which it was intended to abandon. The Collector's estimate, omitting five tanks which he thought would be retained, gave 22,759 acres as the area of tanks to be abandoned, and of this it was supposed that three-fifths, or 13,572 acres, could be rendered cultivable.

2. Shortly after the project was opened it was felt, chiefly for the following reasons, that it would be rash to give up so many tanks—

First, very little was known of the capabilities of the Periyár reservoir in bad years and it might hereafter prove of very great importance to impound local drainage and save Periyár water.

Second, owing to the capacity of the tunnel being found much less than was intended and to the Suruilyar channel drawing a much larger supply from the river than previously, only about 1,000 cubic feet per second of Periyár water can be reckoned on at the head of the main canal. There is, of course, also the natural supply of the Vaigai, but this is small except when the river is in fresh.

3. Whatever endeavour the ryots may use, it takes a long time to bring a large tract under cultivation, and moreover, contrary to the assumption made in the calculations of the project, ryots who intend to raise only one crop will not begin its cultivation immediately water is let down, but prefer to await the time that suits them best. Though there is much absorption in the early part of the season if full supply is let down, then it would probably not be all used, and if not let down all the more would in ordinary years be lost over the reservoir escape. Whatever error there may have been in the assumption that the period of maximum demand will coincide with the period of good supply in the Periyár will be neutralized by retaining a certain number of tanks and whatever delay in passing on water may be caused by filling the tanks to the level of the higher sluices will be more than compensated by the tanks being full at the end of the rains when it may be desirable to spare the Periyár water.

4. Proposals were accordingly made and approved by Government in G.O., No. 710 I., dated 19th August 1896, to retain 80 of the 231 tanks in the Madura taluk and give up the remaining 151 which irrigated only 5,858 acres and had a waterspread of 3,189 acres, of which probably 2,000 acres can be fitted for cultivation. The tanks to be retained have a waterspread of 8,663 acres, but this includes the five large tanks referred to in paragraph 1. The selection of tanks to be retained was made with a view to catching up all ordinary rainfall drainage, and the tanks given up are the

small and shallow ones from which a large proportion of the water would be lost by evaporation. In exceptional cases tanks which might otherwise be given up are retained where they are required as flood moderators or as distributary reservoirs or for the domestic supply of villages in the hot weather.

5. Of over 1,000 tanks in the Melur taluk, Government approved in G.O., No. 176 I., dated 20th February 1897, of the retention of 47 having a waterspread of 3,284 acres. This reduces the irrigable tank-bed area by another 2,000 acres, or for the two taluks by probably 6,000 acres. The project will lose the possible sale-proceeds of this area, some portion of the expected revenue (as some less productive land will have to be taken up in substitution for it) and the cost of maintaining the tanks will increase the maintenance charges. On the other hand a great part of the water, which, however imperfectly, irrigated some 30,000 acres of land under rainfed tanks, will be saved and the distribution of Periyár water so regulated that a full supply can be issued from the reservoir in the south-west monsoon without any being wasted.

6. In dealing with the so-called abandoned tanks it will not be possible in most cases to cut the bund in the deep part of the tanks, as that is opposite the cultivated land a drainage channel through which would be expensive. In many cases, too, it will be more convenient to lower the tank only to the level of the high level sluices and use the old sluices and distributaries instead of constructing new ones. The lowering of the water level can generally be best effected by lowering the escape and escape channel which are most frequently at the flanks, and channels may have to be cut to them through the tank beds. No rule can be laid down; each tank must be considered separately and the probable cost cannot be ascertained without detailed estim ates. The question how the cost is to be met has now arisen. The estimate of "works" of the project contained no provision for it, nor does the estimate of "revenue" contain any credit for amounts to be realized by the sale of the tank beds. The waste land hitherto sold in the Madura taluk has brought in over Rs. 100 an acre, and the tank beds which will be amongst the richest land under the channels and the most easily fitted for irrigation, should fetch at least as much. The sum realized in this way is expected to be largely in excess of the cost of lowering the tanks and as 4 per cent. on the sale-proceeds of the reclaimed land will be credited annually to the project under the Orders of the Government of India, No. 191, dated 11th August 1892 (printed with G.O., No. 1026 R., dated 7th October 1892), it seems fair to treat the cost of draining the beds and fitting them for cultivation as a set off against this instead of debiting it to some head of revenue unconnected with the project. The Examiner of Public Works Accounts states that he "sees no objection to the cost of the improvements in question forming a charge against Project funds under 49. Irrigation—Imperial, or 43. Minor Works and Navigation—Provincial, according as new or old irrigation derives benefit from the outlay thus proposed" as the improvements are intended only for the extension of irrigation and old irrigation will not be affected. The former case is the only one that need be considered. The Examiner thinks that, if the expenditure is to be debited to the project, the sub-head affected would be —

(2) Main canals and branches—15. Miscellaneous;

and advises that if the proposal to debit the project is approved, the proposal to act accordingly should be reported to the Government of India for information and orders. The particular method of treating the charges in the accounts is for the accounts officers to settle afterwards; the question now referred to Government is whether the cost of draining the tanks is to be charged against project funds and what limit is to be fixed to the expenditure. Although no estimate can be given, it is pretty certain that in nearly every case the cost will be well within the sale-proceeds of the tank beds, and if Government desires it can be made a rule that in no case shall the cost of draining a tank or group of tanks exceed the sum which the revenue officers expect to realize by the sale of the beds.

Satyamangalam,
8th December 1898.

(Signed) W. HUGHES,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

ORDER—No. 201 I., dated 24th February 1899.

Ordered that a copy of these Proceedings be forwarded to the Government of India with a request that early orders may be communicated on the questions raised in the concluding paragraph of the foregoing note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation regarding the incidence of the cost of draining the beds of abandoned tanks under the Periyár project to render them fit for cultivation.

[Here enter No. 202 I., dated 24th February 1899.]

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUGHES,
Joint Secy. to Government,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
,, Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.
,, Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
,, Revenue Department.
,, Financial Department.

ENDORSEMENT—No. 202 I., dated 24th February 1899.

Forwarded.

(By order.)

(Signed) W. HUGHES,
Joint Secy. to Government,
Irrigation Branch.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
IRRIGATION BRANCH.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Note about the incidence of the cost of draining the beds of abandoned tanks under the Periyar Project

UNDER date the

READ the following

From Supg Eng, VI Circle, No. 713 M.D., d/ 18.5.98
Procs: Bd. of Revt. Land Rev., No. 2284 Mis, d/ 24.8.98
From Acct. Genl, Madras, No. 4052 d/ 24.8.98
Revt. Dept endorsement, d/ 6.11.98
Office note to C, No. 344, d/ 11.11.98
Do from C, No. 1352 A/B, d/ 22.11.98

Note by the Chief Eng for Irrigation No. 306 I, d/ 8th Decr. ~~24~~ Novr. /98.

No: 201 I, d/ 24.2.99

Ordered that a copy of these Proceedings be forwarded to the Govt of India with a request that early orders may be communicated on the questions raised in the cor

To The Secretary to Govt, Revt Dept, for favour of counter initials.

W.H.

Print & issue Emergently.

D.S. 9/2/99

1 CO/99

cluding paragraph
of the foregoing note
by the Chief Engineer
for Irrigation regarding
the incidence of the
cost of draining the
beds of abandoned
tanks under the
Periyar project
to render them fit
for cultivation.

Endorsement - No: 202 Dt 24.2.99.

Forwarded.

[illegible]
1/12/88

[illegible]
4.12.98

[illegible]

To
The Chief Engr for I.
Supdg Engr, VI Circle
Ex Engr, [illegible]
Rev Dept.
Irrl Dept.

[illegible]

[illegible]

E. I. Form No 13—2,000—4-6-98.

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

Sent to Government with No. I.,
dated 189 .
Printed with G.O., No. I.,
dated 189 .

REMINDERS ISSUED.

No. 1, dated 189 .
" 2 "
" 3 "
" 4 "
" 5 "

KEEP-WITHS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

Public Works (1898) Department.

Current No: 1257

~~IRRIGATION BRANCH~~.

ISSUE No. 306 I.

To

The Joint Secretary to Govt
P W D Irrign Bch

(Reply to letter No. , dated)

Recd: 10. 2. 99

Dated 8th December 1898

Despatched

Enclosures * 13

* Particulars of Enclosures.

SUBJECT.

Draining the beds of abandoned tanks under the Periyar Project - Note anent the incidence of the cost of

No 3063 I d/ 28-12-98

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation

The estimate of revenue of the Periyar Project on which the forecast which accompanied the revised estimate was based, takes into account the irrigation of the beds of the tanks, nearly all of which it was intended to abandon. The Collector's estimate, omitting five tanks which he thought would be retained, gave 22759 acres as the area of tanks to be abandoned and of this it was supposed that three-fifths or 13572 acres could be rendered cultivable.

Para 24 of Collector's report at page 6 of G.O. 153 Rev. 15-2-92 B

2. Shortly after the Project was opened it was felt, chiefly for the following reasons, that it would be rash to give up so many tanks

C.E. (I) note at page 2 of G.O. 710 I 19-8-96 under Rev G.O. 3605 9-9-96 A

1st very little was known of the capabilities of the Periyar reservoir in bad years and it might hereafter prove of very great importance to impound local drainage and save Periyar water

2° owing to the capacity of the tunnel being found much less than was intended and to the Suruliyar channel drawing a much larger supply from the river than previously only about 1000 cubic feet per second of Periyar water can be reckoned on at the head of the main canal. There is of course also the natural supply of the Vaigai but this is small except when the river is in fresh.

3. Whatever endeavour the ryots may use it takes a long time to bring a large tract under cultivation, and moreover, contrary to the assumption made in the calculations of the project, ryots who intend to raise only one crop will not begin its cultivation immediately water is let down but prefer to await the time that suits them best. Though there is much absorption in the early part of the season if full supply is let down then it would probably not be all used and if not let down all the more would

in

8

in ordinary years be lost over the reservoir escape. Whatever error or there may have been in the assumption that the period of maximum demand will coincide with the period of good supply in the Periyar will be neutralized by retaining a certain number of tanks and whatever delay in passing on water may be caused by filling the tanks to the level of the higher sluices will be more than compensated by the tanks being full at the end of the rains when it may be desirable to spare the Periyar water.

(4) 3. Proposals were accordingly made and approved by Government in G.O. No. 710-I dated 19th August 1896 to retain 80 of the 231 tanks in the Madura taluq and give up the remaining 151 which irrigates only 5.858 acres and had a waterspread of 3189 acres of which probably 2000x acres can be fitted for cultivation. The tanks to be retained have a waterspread of 8663 acres but this includes the five large tanks referred to in para 1. The selection of tanks to be retained

In Rev. [illegible] 3605 / 9-9-96 A

3/5 of 3189 acres roughly

wo

was made with a view to catching up all ordinary rainfall drainage and the tanks given up are the small and shallow ones from which a large proportion of the water would be lost by evapo-ration. In exceptional cases tanks which might otherwise be given up are retained where they are required as flood moderators or as distributary reservoirs or for the domestic supply of villages in the hot weather.

4. Of over 1000 tanks in the Melur Taluq Government approved in G.O. No. 176. I. dated 20th February 1897 of the retention of 47 having a waterspread of 3284 acres. This reduces the irrigable tank bed area by another (+) 2000 acres or for the two taluqs by probably 6000 acres. The project will lose the possible sale proceeds of this area, some portion of the expected revenue (as some less pro-ductive land will have to be taken up in substitution for it) and the cost of maintaining the tanks will increase the maintenance charges. On the other hand a great part of the water, which, however imperfectly, irrigated

In Rev 14/18

(+) 3284

9P

irrigated some 30000 acres of land under rainfed tanks will be saved and the distribution of Periyar water so regulated that a full supply can be issued from the reservoir in the Southwest monsoon without any being wasted.

65 5. In dealing with the so called abandoned tanks it will not be possible in most cases to cut the bund in the deep part of the tanks as that is opposite the cultivated land a drainage channel through which would be expensive. In many cases too it will be more convenient to lower the tank only to the level of the high level sluices and use the old sluices and distributaries instead of constructing new ones. The lowering of the water level can generally be best effected by lowering the escape and escape channel which are most frequently at the flanks and channels may have to be cut to them through the tank beds – No rule can be laid down; each tank must be considered separately and the probable cost cannot be ascertained with

details

detailed estimates. The question how the cost is to be met has now arisen. The estimate of "Works" of the Project contained no provision for it nor does the estimate of "Revenue" contain any credit for amounts to be realized by the sale of the tank beds. The waste land hitherto sold in the Madura taluq has brought in over Rs 100 an acre and the tank beds which will be amongst the richest land under the channels and the most easily fitted for irrigation, should fetch at least as much. The sum realized in this way is expected to be largely in excess of the cost of lowering the tanks and as 4 per cent on the sale proceeds of the reclaimed land will be credited annually to the Project under the orders of the Government of India No. 191 dated 11th August 1892 (printed with G.O. No. 1026 R. dated 7th October 1892) it seems fair to treat the cost of draining the beds and fitting them for cultivation as a set off against this instead of debiting it to some head of revenue unconnected with the Project. The

Examiner

A

16 P

Examiner of Public Works Accounts states that he "sees no objection to the cost of the improvements in question forming a charge against Project funds under 49 Irrigation Imperial or 43 Minor Works and Navigation Provincial, according as new or old irrigation derives benefit from the outlay thus proposed" as the improvements are intended only for the extension of irrigation and old irrigation will not be affected. The former case is the only one that need be considered. The Examiner thinks that if the expenditure is to be debited to the Project the subhead affected would be

(2) Main canals & branches
15 Miscellaneous

and advises that if the proposal to debit the project is approved, the proposal to act accordingly should be reported to the Government of India for information and orders. The particular method of treating the

Charges

charges in the accounts is for the Accounts officers to settle afterwards, the question now referred to Government is whether the cost of draining the tanks is to be charged against Project funds and what limit is to be fixed to the expenditure. Although no estimate can be given, it is pretty certain that in nearly every case the cost will be well within the sale proceeds of the tank beds and if Government desires it can be made a rule that in no case shall the cost of draining a tank or group of tanks exceed the sum which the revenue officers expect to realize by the sale of the beds.

W. Hughes

Chief Engineer for Irrigation

Camp Sattyamangalam
8th December/98

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 274

From The Examiner, P. W. Accts, Madras.

Order

No. 1352 A/B

Dated 22nd November 1898

Received } 23 - do -
Registered

Enclosures Files. ✓

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Abandoned Tanks of the Periyar Project — states that there is no objection to the cost of the improvements of — forming a charge against project funds.

[initials]

[initials] 24/11/98

[initials] 25/11/98

[initials] 25/11

BACK PAPERS.		FURTHER PAPERS.	
No.	Date.	No.	Date.
2344	11-11-98		

Ows.&10
1257/39

E- No. 27.
1,000—16-5-98

KEEP-WITH CURRENT No.

dated 189 .

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1898. { P.W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 22nd November 1898.

OFFICE NOTE No. 1352 A/B

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION. 23 NOV. 1898 274

To

I.

Under the circumstances now explained I see no objection to the cost of the improvements in question forming a charge against project funds-under 49 Irrigation Imperial or 43 Minor Works & Navigation Provincial according as new or old irrigation derives benefit from the outlay thus incurred. The particular sub head affected in the former case, would apparently be

(2) Main Canals and Branches

I5 Miscellaneous.

vide P.W. Code II, Appendix II page LVII - In the latter case there would be no sub-head-.

\# Works for which Capital and Revenue Accounts are not kept.

I think however that, if this be agreed to, the proposal to act accord-ingly should be reported to India for information and orders.

[signature] 22.11.98

C.

[initials] 22/11/98.

E. I. Form No. 22—2,000—8-8-96.

GOVT. OF MADRAS. 1898. P. W. DEPT.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.

Madras, 11th November 1898.

OFFICE NOTE No. 344.

with file

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS. 15 NOV. 1898 No.

for general report. 15.11.98

5

Circulation Register.

To	From	Despatch Date.	Receipt Date.
C	T	11/11/98.	15.11.98

23 NOV. 1898 Enclo to 274

KEEP-WITH.

No. , dated 189 .

734 A B. G

I should be obliged if you will kindly reconsider your No 13 June 1898 as the case was not fully stated in my endorsement No 171 d/ 2.6.98

Under G.O No ~~1092~~ 1026 d/ 7 Oct 1892, 4 per cent of the amount realised by the sale of abandoned tanks in the area commanded by the Penyar Project will have to be credited to the Project but to give the tanks beds any value and fit them for irrigation the beds

must be drained or the water level at least lowered in some way so as to lay dry most of the bed – The cost of doing this will be considerable as nearly 1000 tanks have to be dealt with. Seeing that the Project is to have the full benefit of the improvement which drainage will effect is it allowable to charge the cost of the drainage to other than Project funds and if the Projects be charged with the cost to which sub head of the accounts would the charge be debited.

11-11-98 W. H.

Ch. 9
1257/99

1

Endorsement of the P.W.D. dy 29.6.98 on letter from the Supg Engineer VI Circle No 713 M.D. dy 18-5-98.

To the Under Secy:-

In para 2 of his memo No VI-17 P.R. dy 8.6.96 printed at p 2 of G.O. No 710 I dy 19.8.96 the Chief Engineer for Irrigation stated that in the case of the Rushikulya project it had been decided that the cost of draining tank beds to fit them for cultivation should be debited to 'Land Reve' and that the same course might be followed in the case of the Penizar project. The Supg Engineer VI Circle pointed out that this sub head did not find a place in the "Classification of the transactions of Executive Engineers" and enquired if he was right in classifying the estimates for draining tanks under "Ordinary Irrigation-R[illegible] This communication was referred to the Examiner Public Works Accounts for

then

A

his letter no 713 M.D. dy 18.5.98 B

Endt No 17 dy 2.6.98. J

[r]emarks pointing out that
[a]s under G.O. No 362 I d/ 3.8.87
[t]he sale proceeds of the abandoned
[t]ank bed lands had to be
[c]redited to Land Reve' it was
fair that the cost of fitting
the land for sale should be
debited to the same head of
Account. The Examiner agreed
in this view and stated that
as the expenditure was
incurred in the P.W.D at the
instance of and in the interests
of the Revenue Depᵗ the
works in question should be
regarded as works undertaken
on behalf of another Depᵗ.
The chief Engineer accordingly
requests orders as to whether
estimates for draining tank
beds may be submitted for the
sanction of the Board of Reve
in the same manner as estimates
for 'minor irrigation works'.
The decision as regards the
[dra]ining of tank bed lands
[un]der the Rushikulya project
[re]ferred to by the chief Engineer
does

K

Is there any reference to the Rev. Dept file?

office Note No 734 $\frac{A}{B}$ d/ 13.6

3.

It should have been
S.K.

Without any reference to the Rev: Dept. of Govt.!!
P.J.

Q
K

does not appear to have been communicated to this Dept. But from the papers now forwarded it is observed that the Board of Revenue in consultation with the Chief Engineer arrived at the decision — please see Chief Engineers letter to the Board No 231 d/ 25.5.96. As under the Govt. of India ruling in G.O. No 362 I d/ 3.8.1897 the sale proceeds of waste lands are credited to 'I Land Revenue'. it would appear that as pointed out by the Chief Engineer the expenditure incurred in fitting the land for sale should be debited to '3 Land Revenue'. But it appears that no provision was made in the budget on this account and it is therefore submitted that the Board of Revenue may be asked to report how the proposed expenditure can be met. Please see draft C.M. put up below for approval.

[signature]
P.T.

[initials]
24/7/28

4.

Secy

The question as to which head the expenditure on such items should be debited seems to be one for the Financial Dept to decide. Fin's remarks may therefore somewhat be invited. In the meantime the Bd might be asked whether, *if* it should be decided to debit Land Rev. there are likely to be available any funds for the purpose in the Land Rev Budget for the current year. Please see Om. below.

Ulle
26/7/98.

Issue the Om: Send file to Fin Dept. for remarks.

S.K. 18/7/98

Fin Dept ud
9/7/98

BC
For with
Cml
2.8.98

Z

C. No. 5984

Y

Please see O.M. Financial No 1673 d/ 9.8.98. X

C. No. 2325 Financial transferred R.O to this Dept. with Fin'l Endt. No. 1840 d/ 31.8.98.

W

Lr Under Secy:-

In O.M. No 170 d/ 28.7.9[illegible] the Board of Revenue was asked to report whether the cost of draining the beds of abandoned tanks commanded by the Periyar channels during the current year could be met from the Land Revenue budget. In its Procs No. 2284 Misc d/ 24.8.98 the Board states in reply that it is not in a position to suggest any re-appropriation from the sanctioned grants of the current year under "3- Land Reve- Provincial".

2. The Financial Dept., to which the papers were forwarded for remarks, (when consulting the Board of Revenue) requested the Accountant General to report as to which head the cost should be debited. In reply the Accountant General states in his letter No 4052 d/ 24.8.[illegible] that as the work is necessar[illegible] owing to the construction [illegible]

the Perigar project and as will be carried out by the Professional agency of the P.W.D, the cost should be debited to the P.W.D under "43 Minor Works and Navigation" in charge of P.W. officers.

3. In the Office note from the P.W.D No 310 of 17.10.98. the Joint Secy to Govt. P.W.D (Irrigation Branch) requests that the note of the Examiner of P.W. accounts referred to the Revenue Dept. for remarks under date the 25th June 98 may be returned as G.O. No 1026 Revenue of 7.10.92 which has been brought to his notice seems to dispose of the question. | C. No. 7172 V.

4. Attention is solicited to para 3 of the G.I. letter printed at p. 107 G.O. No 1026 of 7.10.92 and to para 3 of the G.O from which it will be seen that it was decided that "the realizations from sale of lands should be credited to 'Land Revenue' that no portion thereof can | T.

7.

can be utilised in provid[illegible]
drainage and distributary cha[illegible]
or in the improvement of riv[illegible]
communications".

5. For orders as to whethe[r]
the papers may be returne[d]
to the P.W.D as requested i[n]
the Office note in C. No. 717
[illegible]
2.11.98.

Secy

The papers may, it is submitted, be returned to the P.W.D., & the attention of that Dept invited to the Acct Genl's opinion in his letter No 4052 d 24-8-9[8] to the Chief Secretary (Rev Dept C. No ×)

[illegible]
4/11/98

[illegible]
6/11/8

D.P.W. no

× This no number? Why? [illegible]

Papers received d.o. are not registered sir.
[illegible]
4-11-98

C. No. 7172